REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application, and all claims stand rejected. Assignee traverses the rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,937,422, issued to Nelson, et al. (Nelson) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,272,456, issued to de Campos (de Campos). Assignee respectfully disagrees that the cited references render obvious the claimed subject matter of the instant application.

In rejecting claim 1, the office action cites Nelson as disclosing the subject matter of claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended herein to further recite that the source of each text item in the collection of text items is determined, and the step of assigning a weighting includes calculating the weighting for each identified word based on the source of the text item in which the word was identified. This subject matter previously was recited in dependent claim 7, which has been canceled herein. In rejecting claim 7, the office action cited two passages from de Campos: the abstract and the passage at col. 15, line 67 – col. 16, line 8. The abstract of de Campos reads as follows:

> A window of letters is identified within a text sample input. If the window contains matches to reference letter sequences (RLS) contained in multiple sets of n-gram language profiles (profiles), then the longest match is kept and scored for each language. Scoring each language is based on frequency parameters of the matched RLS in profiles for each language. The window is incrementally shifted through the sample and the matching and scoring is done on the letters within the window. At the end of the sample input, the language having the highest cumulative score is identified as the sample's language. Scoring may be improved by restricting the RLS within longer profiles to be full words, using two passes where the second pass disregards languages that are not scored near the highest scoring language during the first pass, favoring matched RLS within profiles of complete words during scoring, favoring longer matched RLS within profiles during scoring, and increasing a score of a match that

> does not frequently appear in many languages. The profiles may be enhanced by removing some of the RLS if the frequency of the RLS does not meet a predefined threshold and a variable threshold.

This passage discloses the general function of the claimed subject matter of de Campos. Nothing in the passage discloses determining a source of each text item in the collection of text items, as recited in amended claim 1, such as, in a non-limiting example, determining whether the source of an e-mail message is a user of an electronic device (i.e., the user authored the e-mail) or if the source of the e-mail message was someone else (i.e., the user received the e-mail from someone else). Determining the source of a text item is useful because, for example, an e-mail authored by the user may reflect better the text usage patterns of the user than does an e-mail authored by someone other than the user.

The second passage from de Campos cited in rejecting claim 7 was col. 15, line 67 to col. 16, line 8, which reads as follows:

> At step 535, the entire sample input has been processed by steps 510 through 530. Additionally, the scores for each of the languages have been incrementally increased based on the longest matches found within the window as it is shifted through the sample input. At this point, one of the languages is identified as the language of the sample input based upon the language having the highest score. Thus, the highest scoring language is the language having the most occurrences of the reference letter sequences in that particular language.

This passage discloses the manner in which de Campos determines which language a text input is written in. As with the abstract, though, this passage does not disclose determining a source of each text item in the collection of text items, as recited in amended claim 1. For at least these reasons, the cited references do not disclose the subject matter recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable and should proceed to issuance.

The assignee disagrees with other positions in the office action as well. For example, in rejecting claim 8, the office action cites the passages at col. 4, lines 5-15 and col. 4, line 66 to col.

5, line 15 of de Campos as disclosing that the text item sources include a user text item source and an external text item source and that text items from the user text item source are assigned a higher weighting than text items from the external text item source. The passage at col. 4, lines 5-15 reads as follows:

> Additionally, the languages having scores within a predefined percentage of the highest scoring language may be identified as close languages. The steps of identifying the window, keeping only the longest match in the window, scoring the longest match and shifting the window through the sample input may be repeated on a second pass using only the close languages instead of all of the possible languages. This advantageously helps to discriminate between several close languages. Thus, the language of the sample input may be identified based upon the highest score of the close languages.

The second passage from de Campos cited in the office action in rejecting claim 8, col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 15, which reads as follows:

> Furthermore, the score may be normalized relative to the frequency parameter when compared to a highest score in all the languages for the match if the frequency parameter indicates that the match is found in relatively few of the languages. Thereafter, the sample input is shifted through the window so that different letters can be matched and scored as described above. Once the sample input has been shifted through the window, the language having the highest score is identified as being the language of the sample input.
> The present invention also provides a method for creating a modified set of language profiles. First, a highest frequency is determined for a reference letter sequence in an initial set of language profiles. If the highest frequency is less than a predetermined threshold, then the reference letter sequence is removed from all of the language profiles in the initial set, typically by removing an entry of the reference letter sequence from each language profile in the initial set.

Nothing in either of these passages discloses that there are user text item sources and external text item sources and that text items from the user text item source are assigned a higher weighting than text items from the external text item source, as required by claim 8, in combination with its other limitations. For at least these reasons, claim 8 is allowable over the cited references and should proceed to issuance.

Independent claim 24 has been amended herein to recite subject matter analogous to that in amended claim 1. The only passage cited in the office action in rejecting claim 24 is col. 8, lines 38-44 of de Campos, which reads as follows:

> The invention may also be practiced in distributed computing environments where tasks are performed by remote processing devices that are linked through a communication network. In a distributed computing environment, program modules may be located in both local and remote memory storage devices.

Nothing in this passage discloses the subject matter recited in amended claim 24. Further, because amended claim 24 recites subject matter analogous to that recited in amended claim 1, claim 24 also is allowable for at least the reasons cited above with respect to claim 1, and it should proceed to issuance.

Because independent claims 1 and 24 are allowable, their respective dependent claims are also allowable and should proceed to issuance. It is noted that the assignee has not, at this time, presented arguments with respect to a number of the dependent claims in the instant application. The assignee nevertheless reserves the right to argue the patentability of all of the dependent claims in the instant application at a future time, should that become necessary.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable. Therefore, the examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
John V. Biernacki
Reg. No. 40,511
JONES DAY
North Point; 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114